KAPLAN HECKER & FINK LLP

350 FIFTH AVENUE | SUITE 7110

NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10118

TEL (212) 763-0883 | FAX (212) 564-0883

WWW.KAPLANHECKER.COM

DIRECT DIAL (212) 763-0883

DIRECT EMAIL mbloch@kaplanhecker.com

January 19, 2021

The Honorable Norman K. Moon United States District Court Western District of Virginia 255 West Main Street Charlottesville, VA 22902

Re: Sines v. Kessler et al., No. 3:17-cv-00072 (NKM)(JCH)

Dear Judge Moon:

We write to address certain issues the Court raised at oral argument held on December 17, 2020 in connection with Defendants' Motion to Exclude Expert Testimony (ECF 826).

First, at the December 17 oral argument, the Court invited defense counsel to file with the Court a list of the specific items to which he was objecting in connection with the expert report of Kathleen Blee and Pete Simi. *See* 12/17/20 Hearing Tr. at 14. To date, however, Plaintiffs are not aware that Mr. Kolenich has filed any such list. The Court may wish to set a deadline for this submission so that the issues can be clarified, and the motion can be decided.

Second, during the oral argument on December 17, Your Honor noted that the cases where experts were permitted to testify about Islamic extremism were "more appropriate here." 12/17/20 Hearing Tr. at 34. As a result, we went back and pulled the expert report in one of those cases within the Fourth Circuit, *United States v. Hassan*, 742 F.3d 104 (4th Cir. 2014). The expert witness in that case was an "International Terrorism Consultant" who, like Blee and Simi, reviewed the evidence gathered in that case and was permitted by the Court to testify about the "meaning and context of various words and phrases used by the defendants which are commonly used by persons practicing extreme Islam; the structure and leadership of groups adhering to the principles of Islamic extremism; and the manner and means employed by extremist Islamic groups to recruit individuals and the process of radicalization which occurs within such groups." *Hassan*, 742 F.3d at 130-131 (internal quotations omitted). A copy of the 63-page expert report submitted at the trial level in *Hassan* is attached as Exhibit 1 for the Court's reference. The specific opinions proffered by the expert in that report that are analogous to the opinions Plaintiffs would like to introduce through the testimony of Blee and Simi are as follows:

• The expert defined a "general objective profile of a prototypical 'homegrown' terrorist network" (p. 5)

- The expert defined five "principle relevant factors as to whether a person or persons might fit the profile of a 'homegrown' terrorist network" (p. 5), including, for example, "The Use of Coded Language and Attempts at Logistical Subterfuge (i.e. Attempts to Secret or Hide One's Activities)" and "The Deliberative Collection and Redistribution of Large Quantities of Terrorist Propaganda"
- The expert concluded, "The fringe jihadi philosophy that is strongly reflected by the evidence gathered in the present case is a common characteristic of contemporary violent extremist networks. . . ." (p. 20)
- The expert discussed the "Islamic Thinkers Society (ITS)," which "insists that it advocates 'intellectual' and 'political' struggle," and opined that in fact, "despite this apparent disclaimer, the ITS has repeatedly engaged in activities that are explicitly designed (and are quite likely) to incite violence," and stated that at least one defendant's computer contained links to the ITS (pp. 37-38)
- The expert further explained, "Throughout the evidence in the present case provided to me by the U.S. Attorney's Office, there are strong indicators of attempts at evading law enforcement and logistical subterfuge through the use of word substitutions and coded language. As confirmed by the account of [Defendant] Boyd, the defendants were aware of the risk that their communications would be intercepted and took precautions designed to muddle the precise meaning of their words." (p. 38)
- The expert opined, "Upon reviewing the evidence assembled in the present case, I have concluded that there is a high probability that the defendants fit the profile of terrorists, and that there is a high probability of the existence of a genuine 'homegrown' terror network. I draw particular attention to the formidable arsenal of weapons already in the possession of defendants Daniel Boyd et al., along with the disturbing sense of imminence in the conversations of co-conspirators regarding the use of deadly force. These are typically considered to be among the final warning signs prior to the execution of a would-be terrorist attack." (p. 59)

Referencing another Fourth Circuit case where the testimony of the same expert was allowed, the Court in *Hassan* held that such testimony would assist the trier of fact because the trial evidence was "complicated, touching by necessity on a wide variety of ideas, terms, people, and organizations connected to radical Islam." *Hassan*, 742 F.3d at 131 (quoting *United States v. Benkahla*, 530 F.3d 300, 309 (4th Cir.2008). This particular expert in Islamic extremism has testified as an expert on at least 30 occasions, including multiple times within the Fourth Circuit. *See* Ex. 1 at 3-4. While Plaintiffs reiterate that Blee & Simi will not opine as to the existence of a conspiracy, courts have found that expert testimony like theirs regarding certain distinctive techniques of particular groups can be relevant and admissible in a conspiracy case.

Third and finally, it bears noting that recent events have only highlighted the use of coded language by domestic extremist groups like the defendants in this case to achieve violent ends. As detailed in the attached article regarding the use of "far-right symbols that appeared at the U.S. Capitol riot," many participants in the violent attacks of January 6, 2021 utilized symbolism well-known to "insiders" within extremist groups to convey certain beliefs or affiliations that remain obscure to untrained observers. Ex. 2. Because of the prevalence of this type of "double-

speak" that endures within white supremacist culture, it would be helpful to a jury to have such communications decoded by experts like Blee and Simi.

Dated: January 19, 2021 Respectfully submitted,

<u>/s/ Michael L. Bloch</u>

Michael L. Bloch (pro hac vice) KAPLAN HECKER & FINK LLP 350 Fifth Avenue, Suite 7110 New York, NY 10118 Telephone: (212) 763-0883 mbloch@kaplanhecker.com

Of Counsel:

Roberta A. Kaplan (pro hac vice) Julie E. Fink (pro hac vice) Gabrielle E. Tenzer (pro hac vice) Yotam Barkai (pro hac vice) Emily C. Cole (pro hac vice) Alexandra K. Conlon (pro hac vice) Jonathan R. Kay (pro hac vice) Benjamin D. White (pro hac vice) KAPLAN HECKER & FINK LLP 350 Fifth Avenue, Suite 7110 New York, NY 10118 Telephone: (212) 763-0883 rkaplan@kaplanhecker.com jfink@kaplanhecker.com gtenzer@kaplanhecker.com ybarkai@kaplanhecker.com ecole@kaplanhecker.com aconlon@kaplanhecker.com jkay@kaplanhecker.com bwhite@kaplanhecker.com

Karen L. Dunn (pro hac vice)
Jessica E. Phillips (pro hac vice)
William A. Isaacson (pro hac vice)
PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON &
GARRISON LLP
2001 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-1047
Telephone: (202) 223-7300
Fax: (202) 223-7420
kdunn@paulweiss.com
jphillips@paulweiss.com

wisaacson@paulweiss.com

Katherine M. Cheng (pro hac vice) BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP 1401 New York Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20005 Telephone: (202) 237-2727 Fax: (202) 237-6131

Fax: (202) 237-6131 kcheng@bsfllp.com

Robert T. Cahill (VSB 38562)
Alan Levine (pro hac vice)
Philip Bowman (pro hac vice)
Amanda L. Liverzani (pro hac vice)
Daniel P. Roy III (pro hac vice)
COOLEY LLP
55 Hudson Yards
New York, NY 10001
Telephone: (212) 479-6260
Fax: (212) 479-6275
rcahill@cooley.com
alevine@cooley.com

David E. Mills (pro hac vice) Joshua M. Siegel (VSB 73416) Alexandra Eber (pro hac vice) Caitlin B. Munley (pro hac vice) Samantha A. Strauss (pro hac vice) **COOLEY LLP** 1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Suite 700 Washington, DC 20004 Telephone: (202) 842-7800 Fax: (202) 842-7899 dmills@cooley.com jsiegel@cooley.com aeber@cooley.com cmunley@cooley.com sastrauss@cooley.com

pbowman@cooley.com aliverzani@cooley.com droy@cooley.com

J. Benjamin Rottenborn (VSB 84796) WOODS ROGERS PLC 10 South Jefferson St., Suite 1400 Roanoke, VA 24011 Telephone: (540) 983-7600 Fax: (540) 983-7711 brottenborn@woodsrogers.com

Counsel for Plaintiffs

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on January 19, 2021, I filed the foregoing with the Clerk of Court through the CM/ECF system, which will send a notice of electronic filing to:

Elmer Woodard 5661 US Hwy 29 Blairs, VA 24527 isuecrooks@comcast.net

James E. Kolenich Kolenich Law Office 9435 Waterstone Blvd. #140 Cincinnati, OH 45249 jek318@gmail.com

Counsel for Defendants Jason Kessler, Nathan Damigo, Identity Europa, Inc. (Identity Evropa), Matthew Parrott, and Traditionalist Worker Party

Bryan Jones 106 W. South St., Suite 211 Charlottesville, VA 22902 bryan@bjoneslegal.com

Counsel for Defendants Michael Hill, Michael Tubbs, and League of the South David L. Campbell
Justin Saunders Gravatt
Duane, Hauck, Davis & Gravatt, P.C.
100 West Franklin Street, Suite 100
Richmond, VA 23220
dcampbell@dhdglaw.com
jgravatt@dhdglaw.com

Counsel for Defendant James A. Fields, Jr.

William Edward ReBrook, IV The ReBrook Law Office 6013 Clerkenwell Court Burke, VA 22015 edward@rebrooklaw.com rebrooklaw@gmail.com

Counsel for Defendants Jeff Schoep, National Socialist Movement, and Nationalist Front

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I further hereby certify that on January 19, 2021, I also served the following non-ECF participants, via electronic mail, as follows:

Richard Spencer richardbspencer@icloud.com richardbspencer@gmail.com Christopher Cantwell @gmail.com

Vanguard America c/o Dillon Hopper dillon hopper@protonmail.com Robert "Azzmador" Ray azzmador@gmail.com

Elliott Kline a/k/a Eli Mosley eli.f.mosley@gmail.com deplorabletruth@gmail.com eli.r.kline@gmail.com

Matthew Heimbach matthew.w.heimbach@gmail.com

<u>/s/ Michael L. Bloch</u>

Michael L. Bloch (pro hac vice) KAPLAN HECKER & FINK LLP

Counsel for Plaintiffs